HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 14 Wednesday, April 8, 1959 Washington, D. C.

News Section

CASTRO: *The facade disintegrates* ..... (page 1)
GOP: *Naming Alcorn's successor* ..... (page 1)
STRAUSS: *Left-wing lynching bee* ..... (page 3)
HOUSING: *San Antonio story* ..... (page 4)
LABOR: *How the bosses take control* ..... (page 4)

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

The Castro Bubble Bursts: In the Nation's Capital, observers veer to the opinion that Fidel Castro and his regime face a thorough debunking in the forum of American opinion. Numerous reports of Communist activity in Cuba have created a belief among members of Congress that the United States—aroused by the Communist mailed fist in far-off Tibet—ought to examine the rise of Communist power on our very threshold, in the Caribbean.

Significant of change among those previously favorable to Castro is the reversal of opinion on Cuba in the Catholic press. Last week, HUMAN EVENTS reported the 180-degree shift on the Cuban situation by Dale Francis, a Catholic columnist formerly pro-Castro.

Indicating a shift in other quarters, too, was the surprisingly frank story on Cuba authored last week by Drew Pearson, in which the nationally syndicated columnist (who three months ago ran a favorable report on Castro) comes up with the charge that Castro was "the No. 1 Leader" of the bloody Bogota, Colombia, revolt of 1948, which exploded right under the nose of US Secretary of State George C. Marshall. This was regarded as one of the cleverest Communist coups in many years.

Pearson also says that "*The New York Times*, the Columbia Broadcasting System and others who have built up Fidel Castro have been quite superficial in the reporting of the factors and influences around Castro." Pearson goes on to report massive infiltration of Cuba today by the Communists.

In press circles, there runs much talk that soon various journalists, hitherto sold on Castro, will be scurrying to "get off the hook."

One publication does not need to get off any hook. HUMAN EVENTS was the first in this country to throw light on Castro's Communist associations, in a story appearing August 17, 1957. This item on the Cuban uprising carried an interview with the Hon. Spruille Braden (former Ambassador to Cuba and expert on Latin-American affairs), who said of Castro: "He is a fellow traveller, if not a member of the Communist party and has been so for a long time. . . . The appearance of this Cuban at the head of the recent uprising in his own country stamps the insurrection as another part of the developing Communist pattern of such subversion throughout Latin America." Other items commenting on Castro's Red affiliations, and foreshadowing the current turn of his dictatorship, appeared in HUMAN EVENTS throughout 1958 (April 7, April 14, May 19, July 7, October 6).

Almost three months ago, (January 14, 1959), HUMAN EVENTS reported: "Fidel Castro is in power today because the United States Government put him there . . . more than ten months before the final flight of Batista, the United States clamped an effective embargo on all arms aid to his regime, while the Castro forces were being supplied by gun-runners operating out of Florida and Texas."

While the writers who "built up Castro" deserve to beat their breasts in contrition, the primary responsibility —according to old hands here—falls on such agencies of Government as the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency. For journalists writing on foreign matters to a large extent depend on information and leads from the State Department.

The State Department has followed a sympathetic policy towards such as Castro in bucking anti-Communist strong men in Latin America, the while shovelling funds to such pro-Red dictators as Sukarno, helping them put down anti-Communist and pro-democratic resistance. The CIA, it is reported, has also taken this course—which many now call "Operation Cross-eyed."

● Next week, Castro is scheduled to visit Washington and face interrogation before the convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Washington conservatives hope that some of the more independent-minded of the group will use the occasion to query the pro-Red dictator about some of the more brutal aspects of his regime (see "Add Castro," on page 4 of this News Section).

GOP National Chairman: Whatever the outcome of the meeting of the Republican National Committee this week, Capitol Hill has given its members some extensive, down-to-earth political advice. It runs: The selection of a new Chairman (to succeed Meade Alcorn), as well as other business confronting the Committee, should be shaped by the wishes and attitudes of the grass roots. After last fall's defeat, a new look is needed, and the weather-vane of hinterland feeling should serve as the guide.

Specifically, a national Chairman (according to the pros on Capitol Hill) should be one who will be not merely "acceptable" to, but enthusiastically the choice of, the Middle West. HUMAN EVENTS reported (January 7, 1959) that professional opinion was unanimous in believing it virtually impossible for the GOP to win the 1960 election without the Midwest. Electoral College figures show that.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Chairman should be selected only after consultation with the Senators from Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, Kansas, Colorado. In these states, Republican Senators Martin, Curtis, Mundt, Schoeppel and Allott are preparing for the fight of their lives in 1960. They and many members of the House should have the veto on the naming of a party leader. (One name mentioned favorably on the Hill is that of Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, who served as Chairman in 1952. Summerfield, a Midwesterner, has a wide acquaintance among Republicans throughout the country.)

Assertions that the President this year has the right to name the Chairman—it is contended—should be dismissed as impracticable. That custom has validity if the President is running for re-election; but Ike is not. In view of the debacle of last fall's elections, the rank and file of the party, who are the best judges of what the grass roots want, should put forward and elect a Chairman. These considerations far transcend those concerning the attitudes of various candidates for the post towards Nixon or Rockefeller.

The name of Senator Thruston Morton of Kentucky has loomed importantly in preliminary talk. A Chairman from Kentucky, it is observed, will be of little help to the principal mission of winning the Midwest. Also, the big money boys are not likely to loosen up for "liberal" Morton. Morton has been traditionally a "liberal," although reportedly he has recently been inclining rightward in some of his opinions. However that may be, his voting record on the Americans for Democratic Action scoresheet for last session reveals him as following the line of the ADA five times out of twelve key test issues. That's too many for comfort for the conservative rank and file of the party.

Tibet: The State Department's contention that suppression of the revolt in Tibet will prove a serious blow to Red China's prestige in Asia is not shared along Diplomatic Row in Washington. Veteran diplomats with many years experience in the Far East say that appraisals of "face," not judgments as to moral purity, are the inevitable response among Asiatics to an encounter between mortal enemies; and Red China seems to have won a victory, at least temporarily, by suppressing the Tibetan rising against Communist despotism.

Old China hands figure it this way: The revolt in Tibet (and recent similar insurrections in Southern China and Sinkiang against Peiping) came about, in large part, because the Red Chinese regime had suffered a stinging defeat at the hands of the United States in the Formosan affair last fall. As a result of Dulles' firm policy of not yielding an inch on Quemoy and Matsu, and Red China's meek termination of hostilities in the face of that firmness, the Red Chinese regime suffered a loss of face throughout Asia. Not the least were the repercussions in Tibet and various Chinese provinces remote from Peiping. Hence the recent revolts in those areas.

Old China hands point out: Logically the Red Chinese Government will enjoy enhanced prestige in the Eastern hemisphere. There is no parallel with the aftermath of the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolt in 1956. Asia is not Europe and Tibet is not Hungary; the psychological differences are vast.

The only significant parallel consists in the fact that the United States, leader of the Free World, did nothing to help the revolts (directly or indirectly) either in Hungary or in Tibet. And that fact, spelled out unmistakably to the peoples of the Far East, reduces US prestige and adds to Red China's.

Front-Runner Falters: On the big green board charting Presidential hopefuls in the Nation's Capital, markers chalk upward the ratings of Senator Hubert Humphrey (D.-Minn.) and downgrade the market demand for Senator John F. Kennedy (D.-Mass.), hitherto assessed as the most likely candidate for the nomination.

As this phenomenon appeared in the past few weeks, many amateurs, knowing the volatility of pre-convention popularity tests, might have dismissed it as "technical adjustment." But political analysts in Washington probe deeper and suspect it might have serious consequences for the stock of the youthful Senator from the Bay State.

For, word goes round that the touchy "religious question" is hurting Kennedy in a surprising way. It is not that non-Catholics are turning away from him. On the contrary, it is that many Catholics are offended by his declarations on issues affecting them in the March 3 issue of *Look* magazine.

In that piece, Kennedy took a stand for separation of church and state (as did Al Smith in 1928). But Kennedy additionally opposed naming of an ambassador to the Vatican (which a number of non-Catholics have urged, to strengthen anti-Communist solidarity), opposed Federal aid to parochial schools and dodged either flat opposition to or support for aid to parochial school buses, lunches, *etc.*; he also reiterated his support of foreign aid to Communist Yugoslavia, where dictator Tito persecutes Catholic Cardinal Stepinac.

This article drew criticism from such Catholic publications as *Ave Maria* (Notre Dame University fathers), *America* (Jesuit) and *Commonweal* ("liberal" lay Catholic weekly). On the other hand, in his home state, Cardinal Cushing came to the defense of the Senator. Finally, professional anti-Catholics did the Senator no good by praising his stand.

A tempest in a tea-kettle? Checking up with priests and laity, HUMAN EVENTS finds that mounting opposition to Kennedy for President is significant, for much of it comes from Catholics who had previously been favorable to him. Political observers believe that Kennedy went too far and stirred up too many wellsprings of conflicting feelings. If he had limited himself to a broad but definite statement instead of piling up a number of declarations on frictional issues, he would have avoided this trouble—so say political observers.

For instance, Kennedy's reiterated approval of aid to Communist Tito of Yugoslavia feeds growing suspicion that the young legislator has been following a course laid down for him by left-wing advisers; his 100 per cent voting record on the ADA line last session is not forgotten. All in all, Kennedy seems to have talked too much on a tender subject.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 14 HUMAN EVENTS April 8, 1959
Article Section I
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

'Understanding'—Playing the Soviets' Game

By EDWARD J. JANISCH
Assistant Professor of Government
Pennsylvania State Teachers' College

THREE MONTHS AGO, Mr. Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court spoke before a college assembly on the topic, "Communism and the Rise of the Peoples of Asia." When he finished his speech a member of the audience asked him: "Sir, what can we do to acquaint our students with the nature of communism?"

Mr. Justice Douglas answered that they could read newspapers from these countries, and better still, they might go there for a visit, and talk to the people. There is a need, he said, for understanding. World peace depends on understanding.

This answer did not come as a surprise to me. I have been hearing it for some time now; among its advocates are some of the most influential men and women in America today; their words daily reach the ears of millions of people, and for millions, it is the only story they will hear.

A few examples: Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt recently appeared on Arthur Godfrey's program, discussed the need for better understanding, and told about the "excellent education" everybody gets in the Soviet Union; of course, they also have a wonderful preventive medicine program too (she wasn't joking). To increase her understanding, Mrs. Roosevelt has studied the Russian language for two years, but she hasn't got very far because the alphabet has her stumped (the author, somewhat slow in learning languages, mastered this in about two hours; it would take the average person no longer).

Similarly, Dr. Gardner Murphy, brilliant author of an important work on the theory of personality, spoke to a large college convocation this past summer. His topic? Understanding. Unless we begin to understand one another, we will blow each other up. On all the "liberal" juke-boxes, the number one hit is the same: Understanding.

It will do no good to tell these people that there was a great deal of "cultural exchange" and "understanding" among Americans and Japanese and Germans before 1941. That the Germans and the French have been neighbors for centuries, and that they have fought three bloody wars since 1870. That over the past 25 years the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, and that of the 52 major agreements that followed, the Soviets have broken 50 of them. That there is plentiful proof that any benefits from understanding are therefore highly speculative, and outright dangerous if entered into uncritically. I suggested all of this to Dr. Gardner Murphy, and he practically told me that I was an old mossback who had studied dead things like history and government and philosophy to the extent that it damaged my chances of ever really "understanding on the peoples level"—whatever that means.

For no less reason than the safety of us all, this whole notion of understanding, particularly in regard to Soviet Russia, needs to be seen by the public without benefit of pink glasses.

Webster's Universal Unabridged Dictionary defines the word "understanding" as follows: 1) The act of a mind which understands; the faculty of *comprehension*; the ability to obtain *correct information*. 2) Knowledge; exact comprehension. 3) Intelligence between two or more persons; *agreement of minds*; *union of sentiments*. (Italics added)

The preachers of understanding tell us that it will lead to world peace. But surely this is strange, unless "understanding" no longer means "the faculty of comprehension" to them. I wonder if they would preach understanding if the "comprehension" and the "correct information" we obtained led us to view the Soviet Union as a hostile, materialistic, military establishment eager for our demise?

Perhaps the preachers of understanding do not want this kind of dictionary definition. Very well, there is still another part of the definition: "agreement of minds," "union of sentiments." If this is their meaning, the concept is lethal, and it is precisely the way in which Khrushchev defines the term.

WHAT AMERICAN today can in innocence say that he is ignorant of Soviet tactics and objectives? The shooting down of our unarmed transport, a savage act of a kind unknown even to primitive people when they meet a stranger, is but the most recent example of Soviet understanding. From the bloody beginnings of this state with the butchering of the Tsar and his family, to the starvation of the peasants and the enslavement of Eastern Europe, to the firing of phosphorous bombs on the population of Budapest, this regime has spoken with its deeds. Understanding indeed!

An *exchange* or *understanding* cannot take place unless two parties are willing to examine a proposition freely. This condition clearly does not exist in the Soviet Union, nor is it likely that it will appear under the present regime. Understanding and cultural exchanges, as now proposed by people in our country, can only serve those dedicated to our destruction. And to prove that none of the conditions necessary for real understanding exist in Soviet Russia, I would like to examine the following items: (1) What is the nature of the Soviet regime? (2)

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is its ideology? (3) What picture of America does the regime hold? (4) What is the legal status of the Soviet citizen—how free is he to participate in this understanding? Because I do not wish to misinterpret the Soviets, I will let them speak for themselves, through their own official sources.

(1) The nature of the regime: " . . . the Communist party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) . . . is the vanguard of the working people in their struggle to strengthen and develop the socialist system and is the leading core of all organizations of the working people, both public and State." (Art. 126, Soviet Constitution). The Soviet Union is a totalitarian state directed by an elite which is the "leading core" of *all* organizations. Any understanding, therefore, is dependent upon the will of the party.

(2) Let us consider the will of the party, the ideology of the leading core of all organizations. Marx had it: "Let the ruling classes tremble at the thought of a Communist revolution." Lenin, instigator and sire of the Soviet state, outlined the plan for the seizure of Central Europe and Asia, after which America would fall like an overripe fruit. At the Twentieth Party Congress, Shepilov stated: "The capitalist and the Communist outlooks may never be reconciled." Khrushchev was blunt in November, 1956: "If you don't like us, don't accept our invitations and don't invite us to come to see you. Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you."

A delegate at the Twentieth Party Congress used plain language to explain the "peaceful transition to socialism" which supposedly will follow from understanding and cooperation with people in the capitalist countries. Some examples of "peaceful transition": 1) The annexation of the Baltic states in 1940; 2) The conquest and capture of Eastern Europe after the Second World War; 3) In particular, the conquest of Czechoslovakia in 1948.

IF WE EXAMINE the picture of America and the West which is systematically fed to the Russian people, we discover still another feature of the impossibility of understanding with Soviet Russia. *Bolshevik,* the organ of the Central Committee, paints this picture of World War II:

"Hitlerite Germany, instigated by American and English imperialists, suddenly and faithlessly attacked the Soviet Union . . . [Truman and Churchill] openly formulated this policy." And we also learn from this source that only when it was clear that the Soviet Union could end the war for itself did the allies grudgingly open a second front. And, four months after the German collapse, the main forces of imperialist Japan were routed thanks to the blitz operation of the Soviet army.

The lies are so fantastic that it all smacks of lunacy. But if the apostles of understanding really want to *comprehend,* let them contemplate the official Soviet fantasy of American experimental stations where we used poison gas, and the bacteria of plague and cholera, on living human beings! On the cultural level, similarly, the Soviets leave us no doubts. We learn that "Faulkner is flesh of flesh of a decaying society who shares the hopelessness of his hideous characters." Eugene O'Neill is a "completely degenerate individual." He and "Thornton Wilder promote fascism in their plays." Further, "modern American literature is the mortal enemy of freedom, humanity, human dignity and the people." "*The Man Who Come to Dinner* is a counter-revolutionary play." American music is "psychopathic." But what of Van Cliburn? He paid his debt when he said that Khrushchev treated him like his "daddy." That, though the young man is talented, is worth a dozen awards.

Thus, on the three preceding counts, understanding is impossible. But it is precisely here that the preachers of understanding shout as one: "Talk to the people."

This point is especially interesting, because, for the Soviet citizen, free speech does not exist. Soviet Foreign Minister Vyshinsky wrote:

"In our state, naturally, there is and can be no place for freedom of speech, of the press, and the other freedoms for the foes of socialism. Every attempt by them to use these freedoms . . . must be classified as a counterrevolutionary crime to which Article 58, paragraph 10, or one of the corresponding articles of the Criminal Code is applicable." (The penalty ranges from imprisonment to death by shooting.) Vyshinisky adds: "It is no use to argue that ideas should be opposed only by ideas."

But let us assume that, in spite of all of this, someone still goes to the Soviet Union, in the hope of finding some person willing to talk to him. What then? Contacts with foreigners, *unless* they are Government sponsored, are discouraged, and are dealt with in Article 58-4 of the Soviet Criminal Code:

"Assisting in any way the international bourgeoisie . . . as well as assisting social groups and organizations which are influenced or directly organized by the bourgeoisie in their hostile action against the USSR, is punished by deprivation of liberty for at least three years with the total or partial confiscation of property; in cases of particularly aggravating circumstances the penalty is raised to include the supreme measure of social defense—death by shooting . . . "

We are left with absolutely no basis for contact, much less understanding. "If you don't like us . . . don't invite us to come to see you . . . Wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle . . . We will bury you . . . We have the ICBM in serial production . . . " So goes the official policy, and with it, all talk of understanding by its American advocates becomes meaningless.

Indeed, there is only one type of exchange and understanding desired by the Soviets, and all concerned should understand that it is aimed at the destruction of America.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "'UNDERSTANDING'—PLAYING THE SOVIETS' GAME" at $ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 14 HUMAN EVENTS April 8, 1959

Article Section II

LIBRARY
STATE COLLEGE
FALLS, WISCONSIN

Spending Yourself Rich

Or: All Aboard for the Trillion-Dollar Escalator Ride!

By MORLEY CASSIDY

DR. SUMNER H. SLICHTER of Harvard holds a unique place among present-day economists. Heretofore, most of the pitchmen for Old Doctor Kickapoo's Magic Inflation have been the sort who wore checkered vests and solid-brass watch-chains. They made their pitch to yokels and winked broadly as they stressed the instant exhilaration from a swig of Old Kickapoo. Dr. Slichter is different.

As Harvard's Lamont Professor of Economics he has solid standing. He ignores the yokels and talks directly to lesser economists and bedazzled businessmen. Instead of a suitcase on a tripod, he is given a forum in the United States Senate and *The New York Times*.

Even his pitch is different. Old Kickapoo, he says, has now been modified for household use. The Exhilaration Content has been reduced to a mere two per cent a year—just enough to maintain a constant glow of health.

It has been a wonderfully successful pitch, and Dr. Slichter is now the top salesman in Old Kickapoo's stable, with a devoted following of addicts among those US Senators commonly known as "The Spenders."

Dr. Slichter and his followers do not content themselves with saying that Old Kickapoo is nothing to worry about. They declare belligerently that a steady decline in the buying power of the dollar —in other words, higher prices—is a wonderful thing. It makes the country strong, increasing its productive capacity.

This idea of spending yourself rich is so appealing to one of my temperament that I pounced eagerly on an article by Dr. Slichter, frankly headed "Argument for Creeping Inflation," in a recent *New York Times* Sunday Magazine. Somehow it tasted just like Old Kickapoo always did.

Dr. Slichter began by kicking the shins of that other famous economist, Walter Reuther, and others in the Labor Union School of Economics who are always hotly denying that wages have been pushing up prices. They certainly *have* pushed up prices, he says.

In the past ten years, Dr. Slichter points out, hourly wages have risen twice as fast as labor's boasted productivity, measured in output per man-hour. And it hasn't been a case of wages trying to catch up with prices, as the Reuther-Meany-McDonald economists keep saying.

On the contrary, according to Dr. Slichter, the rise in hourly wages exceeded the rise in prices in nine of the last ten years. "Wages were not chasing prices up; prices were chasing wages, and were falling behind each year."

This is the old spiral of inflation that eats away the value of the dollar. And what can be done about it?

Not a thing, says Dr. Slichter cheerfully. To stabilize prices, you'd have to stabilize wages first, and the only way to do that—says Dr. Slichter—is to create unemployment. And this would slow the growth of the Nation's productive capacity.

Right here, you'd think, is where even the yokels might have some questions.

Dr. Slichter has just said that wages are rising twice as fast as individual output, with the gap growing every year, as a result of full employment, abundant money, and union pressure. But why, if the individual's "productive capacity"—his output —goes on lagging a little more each year, does Dr. Slichter think the total for the Nation will suddenly spurt ahead?

And if the lag is growing every year with just a taste of Old Kickapoo, why won't bigger doses increase the lag? Won't there come a point at which any increase in wages, however big, will be more than offset by new reductions in individual output, such as three-month vacations (as Walter Reuther and David McDonald are already suggesting) or 25-hour weeks (the Meany formula), so that the net gain in production is zero—or even a minus quantity?

BUT DR. SLICHTER doesn't wait for questions. He just says there is not much use trying to cope with the pressure of organized labor because "the American workers want their unions." Even an attempt to correct some of the "glaring injustices," such as blackmail picketing or secondary boycotts, he says, might be dangerous. It would just make labor madder and tougher.

So, what's to be done? Nothing. Inflation is here, says Dr. Slichter gaily. So relax and enjoy it.

And how do you do this? It is right here—just

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when things are getting interesting—that Dr. Slichter's answers get a little impatient (just like the older pitchmen, with their "Run along, little boy; you bother me").

One way to enjoy the prospective loss of your dollar's purchasing power, he suggests, is to reflect that your loss is the Nation's gain. Inflation will be making America stronger all the time, building its productive capacity.

That's mighty interesting. It will be especially interesting to Frenchmen and Germans. France since the war has had never-ending inflation that ate away about 93 per cent of the value of the franc before De Gaulle stepped in to restore a degree of budget-balancing. It got steadily sicker on this French version of Old Kickapoo.

Germany, by contrast, began to build productive capacity furiously, from the moment it swore off inflation and went on a hard-money basis with the currency reform of 1948.

As an adept pitchman, of course, Dr. Slichter doesn't stop his spiel long enough to let the yokels ask questions about things like that. But he does recognize that there will be some problems for the individual in this rosy inflated future.

Planned inflation, he concedes offhandedly, "does call for various common-sense adaptations." For instance, he says, people will be smart to quit buying bonds or making other long-term fixed investments unless the yield is very big (and he has since told the Senate-House Joint Economic Committee that the Federal Reserve Board should be trying to bring interest rates down).

In other words, quit saving; you'll be losing a part of your savings every year under the Slichter program. But in that case, who'll put up the money for all the new factories and mills he says are so desperately needed to increase our national productive capacity? I guess he thinks the Government would do the building. (But did you notice that TVA has just asked Congress for permission to sell $750 million in revenue bonds to private investors to finance new expansion? If the investors are listening to Dr. Slichter, they won't lend a penny.)

OF COURSE, Dr. Slichter agrees, there is the question of what's to be done about the silly squirrels who have seen inflation coming, and have been looking forward to pensions, or social security benefits, or income from their savings. What will their dollars buy when they're ready for them?

Oh well, says Dr. Slichter airily, pension plans including social security benefits can be "adapted" to the New Utopia, either with escalator clauses or by being "revised now and then to compensate for the rise in the price level."

It will have to be some escalator, apparently.

The Social Security Trust Fund, according to the US Statistical Abstract for 1959, now amounts to $22.8 billion. Dr. Slichter's escalator will have to carry this (and all the new billions that come in every year) upwards at the rate of three or four per cent a year, compounded. Private pension plans now in force, according to the same source, would add another $29.9 billion. The 20-year load for veterans' pensions, at the current rate, would amount to another $56.6 billion.

I'd hate to think that Dr. Slichter was planning to cheat those who have put their money in life insurance, so there goes another $480 billion. Or those who have been saving for a home in savings and loan associations, so add $32.1 billion. Or insured bank depositors, so add another $26.9 billion.

Would Dr. Slichter gyp those trusting souls who foolishly put their faith in Uncle Sam's bonds? I'm beginning to wonder. But if he's going to be honest with them, it'll cost another $280 billion or so.

Altogether, without half-trying, we've got a grand total of $928.3 billion—oh, call it a round trillon—that Dr. Slichter nonchalantly suggests "revising now and then."

Personally, too, I'm still curious about what Dr. Slichter proposes to do about "escalating" the wages and salaries of the 40.5 million workers who don't belong to any union, but will pay for higher prices.

Dr. Slichter doesn't mention them. Apparently unorganized workers, and the thrifty, are equally expendable in the New Economics of The Spenders.

But there is one fallacy, greater than any of these mere trillion-dollar defects, that destroys the argument for the new, improved, modified "Old Kickapoo."

As better economists than Dr. Slichter have pointed out, his own suggestion for escalator clauses gives the whole thing away. Once creeping inflation is recognized for what it is, the jig is up. From that moment on, every wage-earner, every businessman and every investor will be competing to write his own escalator clause, in self-protection. Then comes the battle of the escalators, carrying everything right through the roof. If Dr. Slichter is still around when that happens, let's hope he's prepared to tell us where he hid the parachutes.

Morley Cassidy is Assistant Editor of the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "The Most Explosive Race Problem Is In The North," November 9, 1957.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "SPENDING YOURSELF RICH" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Observers, however, recoil from counting Kennedy out. The so-called Catholic vote, they warn, is not sure for any candidate, just because he is a Catholic. Yet, on the other hand, many Catholics might well rally behind a Catholic candidate, even should they differ with him on some issues, if anti-Catholicism as such should appear as an issue. In such an event, the present discontent with the Bay State man might well disappear and a strong voting element might come to his rescue.

Labor Bill: Coming up as Congress reassembles after Easter vacation will be the Kennedy-Ervin bill (S 505). Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.) has called this so-called labor reform measure "the old carnival shell game." The Arizonan said that while it looks fine to the man on the street at first glance, it actually does no job of reform at all. "It's loaded with misleading phrases and gimmicks and just like the carnival shell game, leads you to believe there's something underneath when in fact there isn't."

The Kennedy-Ervin bill is filled with what the Republican Senator calls "gimmicks." These are not in the bill "through faulty drafting or oversight. They were put in deliberately to give the bill a facade of effectiveness, when in fact it is not an effective labor reform bill."

For example, the bill requires unions and union officers to file detailed financial reports with the Secretary of Labor. It also requires the unions to make the information in these reports available to their members. This sounds as if members are given a weapon for checking up on abuses and corruption in the union. Actually, the effect is quite otherwise.

The best source of information the Secretary could have of the financial corruption in the union would come from rank and file union members who provided him with the necessary information. Under the Kennedy bill, however, this has been rendered practically impossible because the bill does not compel the union to permit its members access to these basic records and documents. Without such access members cannot tell if the bosses' reports are accurate. Thus the Secretary of Labor's most important source of information concerning corruption is rendered practically useless. (By way of contrast, in practically every state in the union corporate stockholders by law are given the right to examine the corporations books and records.)

Strauss: Washington's left-wingers are currently indulging in their favorite indoor sport—exercise of the double standard. A few years ago, the "liberals" charged that Senator Joe McCarthy's inspection of the State Department and the Army, in search of possible Red agents, was destructive of morale in the Executive arm of Government, and constituted an abuse of congressional powers.

Now a Senate committee is, for blatant partisan reasons, keeping a member of the Executive branch almost permanently on the griddle—and the "liberals," with a few notable exceptions, are mum. The reason: representing the Executive arm this time is a conservative, Admiral Lewis Strauss; his opponent is left-wing Senator Estes Kefauver, who is gunning for Strauss, recently named as Secretary of Commerce, because the Admiral opposes the extension of socialized power, *a la* the Keef's pet boondoggle, TVA. Also goading the left wing to the offensive is the fact that Strauss, when he was with the Atomic Energy Commission, backed scientist Edward Teller, promoting America's crash program for the H-Bomb; and it was Strauss who checked the powerful influence of Red-connected physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer, one-time Svengali of US nuclear policy.

Strauss has always been known as a conservative, and has been close to such public figures as former President Hoover and Senator Taft. Viewing the criticisms levelled at him in recent years, Washingtonians trace the bitterness of the left, not to his over-all conservatism, but to one episode—his successful showdown with Oppenheimer, a key man in the left-wing network. For example, Washingtonians recall the favorable words about Strauss penned by a prominent left-wing commentator on nuclear matters, Michael Amrine—prior to the Oppenheimer affair.

Amrine—now an advocate of nuclear appeasement—wrote in 1953 that even Strauss' enemies "concede that he is an exceptionally devoted public servant . . . he is one of the few top businessmen in the country who really understand the main concepts of fundamental research . . . etc." With the Oppenheimer case in 1954, such kind words for Strauss were no more.

The anti-Strauss vendetta has recently become so crudely partisan that one member of the "liberal" fraternity, columnist Roscoe Drummond, at last broke silence. Strauss, Drummond observed, "was named last November. We are now almost into the fourth month of the present Congress and Chairman Magnuson has calmly adjourned everything until after the Easter recess, still waiting obediently for Senator Kefauver to unsheath his accusations. None of this reflects any credit on the Senate. It impairs the morale of the Department of Commerce."

GOP Manifesto: Republicans in Illinois' Fourth Congressional District recently issued a manifesto demanding that the party stand firm for its principles, protecting our constitutional free enterprise system, and repudiating New Dealism. The statement, signed by 200 Republicans in Rich township, Cook County, was forwarded to the new GOP committee on policy and planning.

The resolution is especially significant because it emanates from a district where the GOP scored a notable triumph last fall, electing conservative Representative Edward J. Derwinski (youngest GOP member of Congress) in the face of the Democratic sweep. Derwinski led the GOP ticket in Illinois by 20,000 votes.

The Republican state committeeman for Rich township, Hayes Robertson, had this comment concerning the GOP resolution: "The New Deal and the welfare state belong to the Democrat party. The duty of the Republican party is to represent that great mass of people who do not subscribe to that philosophy—whether they total 47 per cent or 55 per cent of the voters at any particular time."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Public Housing: The extravagance of a Public Housing official in San Antonio, Texas, in providing plush accessories for a planned 1500-unit development, may cancel all government housing projects in that Texas city.

Even the PHA in Washington was shaken when Mrs. Marie McGuire, its top representative in San Antonio, included expensive electronic eye beams, high speed elevators and courtyard reflecting pools in a design for an old-folks apartment project.

But Washington's reaction was mild compared to that exhibited by irate San Antonio citizens. Spearheaded by the city's Tax Protection Association, they acquired far more than the necessary number of petition signatures to stage a referendum which could knock out the entire public housing program in San Antonio. Ballots will be cast in May.

The controversy recalls a similar one in Los Angeles, several years ago, when the city council, chafing under expensive, long-term commitments to the Federal Government in exchange for some 10,000 public housing units, put the question to the public. When the voters returned an overwhelming verdict against government housing, the mammoth project was killed.

Bricker Amendment: A new move is stirring in the Capital which might have serious effects on US sovereignty. Reportedly in the works is a proposal to place this country at the mercy of the World Court, letting that international body determine which US cases before it constitute international disputes, which are purely domestic matters to be left to the USA. As matters now stand, America has the right—by terms of the 1946 Senate vote accepting the Court's jurisdiction—to decide whether cases involving this country are domestic or international.

The present agitation is aimed at getting this proviso removed from the Senate resolution accepting the Court; if this is accomplished, the Court may at its own discretion decide whether any particular US case is "domestic" or not, and could conceivably involve itself in any and every kind of controversy.

Alarmed conservatives hope that this move can be publicized at the grass roots, and that opposition to it can be mounted before it is slipped through the "liberal"-packed Senate. Such proposals as this, they point out, emphasize the need for a "Bricker Amendment," spelling out that no treaty—such as the agreement involving us with the World Court—can supersede the American Constitution.

Consistent Businessman: Drawing plaudits in the Capital is a businessman who believes in free enterprise and open competition—and practices it even when his own interests are at stake. The businessman in question is Ernest Sterling Marsh, President of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway. As controversy over the plight of US railroads grows—and as the dispute among various segments of the transportation industry becomes more heated—Marsh's forthright words before a Senate investigation subcommittee are recalled by reporters.

"I don't see why," Marsh said, "the farmer in the middle of Kansas or in Texas should be required to pay through taxes, either directly or indirectly, the cost of people flying between Chicago and California 20,000 feet over his head, or the cost of improving the Mississippi River for a barge to go up there, or the cost that would be involved in an appropriation for railroad equipment."

The Bosses Take Over: In its issues of December 22, 1958 and January 14, 1959, HUMAN EVENTS reported instances in which new Democratic Congressmen were installing labor union officials in their Capitol offices. This month's *American Mercury* contains an article giving the background of how one such appointment was forced through by labor-boss pressure. In an article entitled, "Clear it with COPE," veteran newspaperman Willard Edwards reports the plight of one freshman Democrat who had picked a young lawyer to be his administrative assistant. COPE's representatives came to call, saying that the new appointee was not to their liking. He would have to be replaced.

"The young Congressman," Edwards writes, "protested feebly but eventually agreed to discard his original choice and appoint a former union organizer as his chief assistant. This individual took over the hiring of the office staff, carefully examining each job applicant, including clerks and typists, on his labor attitude."

Edwards quotes the Congressman as saying: "I've lost control of my own office force. I've kicked myself for permitting it, but I couldn't forget that I'd never have got to Congress without labor's money and organization. Now, I'm beginning to wonder how far the pay off will extend and whether it's worth it."

Add Castro: Illuminating the sort of "high-minded idealism" behind the Fidel Castro uprising in Cuba was this news last week:

"Captain" Herman Marks, who serves as chief executioner for the Castro regime, is a native of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. A check with police records there—the Associated Press reported last week—shows that Captain Marks, far from being a romantic crusader for Caribbean justice, is an ex-convict with a massive record of 32 arrests. Among the charges: auto theft, robbery, burglary, assault, drunken driving, disorderly conduct. Moreover, this Castro lieutenant served three-and-one-half years in the Wisconsin State Prison for a morals offense involving a young girl.

MRS. JAMES A. REED, widow of the distinguished Senator from Missouri: "I enjoy HUMAN EVENTS because I have found it to be one of the most informative and reliable sources of news coverage that comes across my desk."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* — JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor* — FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED